UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,365	04/16/2004	Chang Yeon Kim	8733.1032.00-US	8096

30827 7590 06/09/2009

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER	
MA, CALVIN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2629	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/825,365	KIM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CALVIN C. MA	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 March 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,5-7,13 and 15* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,5-7,13 and 15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 13 and 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (US Patent 6,369,786) in view of Hashimoto (US Patent 7,113,156) and further in view of Kimura (US Pub: 2002/0105279).

As to claim 1, Suzuki teaches an electro-luminescence display (i.e. organic EL display) (see Fig. 4, Col. 4, Lines 27-33) device, comprising:

gate lines (L1, L2 ... Ly);

data lines crossing the gate lines (i.e. the data lines S1, S2, ...Sx crosses the gate line L to form the matrix) (see Fig. 4, Col. 4, Lines 5- 20);

pixel cells (i.e. current driven display element) at crossing of the gate lines and the data lines (see Fig. 4, Col. 4, Lines 27-29);

a gate driver (1) that sequentially applies a gate signal to the gate lines during one horizontal period (i.e. the gate driver 1 applies the switching to the pixel with the action of scanning drive) (see Fig. 4, Col. 3, Lines 52-65); and

a plurality of data driving circuits (i.e. each of the current and voltage supply CS and C components in 2 and 3) that apply voltage signals to the pixel cells along a data line during a first time (T1) of within the horizontal period and apply current signals to the pixel cells during a second time (T2) within the horizontal period after the first time of the horizontal period (i.e. the first time is for Precharging voltages T1 and the second period is for current driving period T2) (see Fig. 5-6, Col. 5, Lines 27-40),

wherein each of the plurality of data driving circuit includes a voltage driver (5) that applies voltage signals to the data lines to pre-charge the voltage signals onto storage capacitors in the pixel cells, and a current driver (CS1) that allows the current signals corresponding to voltage signal to flow into the pixel cells (see Fig. 5-6, Col. 5, Lines 1-40).

However, Suzuki does not explicitly teach a gamma driver that generates a plurality of gamma voltage signals corresponding to image data and a plurality of gamma current signals corresponding to the image data; and applying the gamma voltage signal to flow into the pixel cells. Hashimoto teaches a gamma voltage driver that generates a plurality of gamma voltage signals corresponding to image data; and applying the gamma voltage signal to flow into the pixel cells (i.e. the plurality of gradation related voltages in applied to the driver based on gamma characteristics) (see Fig. 11, Col. 5, Lines 1-50).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have adopted the plurality of gamma voltages generation data driving circuits of Hashimoto in the OLED driving system of Suzuki in

order to compensate for change in temperature and the change over time to improve the performance of the display system (see Hashimoto Col. 2, Lines 43-58).

Hashimoto and Suzuki does not teach gamma current signals corresponding to the image data, Kimura teaches the gamma current signals corresponding to image data (i.e. the 108 correction circuitry able to output correct current signal based on gamma information) (see Kimura, Figure 8, [0216-0217]).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have both the gamma voltage signal design of Hashimoto and gamma current signal of Kimura in the OLED driving system in order to improve color performance of the OLED display system (see Kimura [0010]).

As to claim 13, Suzuki teaches a method of driving an electro-luminescence display device, comprising:

applying a gate signal from a gate driver during each horizontal period to select pixel cells along specific horizontal period to pre-charge the voltage value onto a storage capacitor of the pixel cells (i.e. during the first time T1 the Precharging voltages 5 is applied and the second period is for current driving period T1 to T2) (see Fig. 5-6, Col. 5, Lines 1-40); and

applying a current value corresponding to the image data to the data lines during a second time within the horizontal period after the first time (i.e. the current drive is applied after the precharge period) (see Fig. 5-6, Col. 5, Lines 1-40).

However, Suzuki does not explicitly teach plurality of gamma voltages signal and gamma current signal. Hashimoto teaches plurality of gamma voltages (i.e. the plurality of gradation related voltages in applied to the driver based on gamma characteristics) (see Fig. 11, Col. 5, Lines 1-50). Kimura teaches current signal based on gamma information (see Fig. 8, [0217]). Therefore, the combination of Suzuki, Kimura and Hashimoto teaches the said limitations.

As to claim 2, Suzuki teaches the electro-luminescence display device according to claim 1, wherein the first time is shorter than the second time (i.e. the timing diagram in Fig. 6 clearly shows that precharge period T1 is shorter then the voltage applying period) (see Fig. 6, Col. 5, Lines 1-40).

As to claim 15, Suzuki teaches the method according to claim 13, wherein the first time is less than the second time (i.e. the timing diagram in Fig. 6 clearly shows that precharge period T1 is shorter then the voltage applying period) (see Fig. 6, Col. 5, Lines 1-40).

3. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Hashimoto and further in view of Kimura as applied in claim 1 above, further in view of Ishizuka et al. (US Patent: 6,756,951)

As to claim 5, Suzuki and Hashimoto teach the electro-luminescence display device according to claim 1, wherein the voltage driver includes:

a plurality of voltage driving circuit (i.e. Voltage source 5) corresponding to each data line that generate a voltage signal corresponding to the image data (i.e. the Precharging voltage is according to the data that is to be applied) (see Fig. 4, 6, Col. 4, Line 40- Col. 5, Line 40); and

a plurality of first switches (i.e. switches C1… Cy) between each of the voltage driving and each of the data lines, wherein the first switches are turned on by a control signal (i.e. by definition the switch are controlled by a signal that control the input of the Precharging voltage) (see Fig. 4, 6, Col. 4, Line 40- Col. 5, Line 40).

However, Suzuki does not explicitly teach a block for each of the individual data voltage driving circuit. Ishizuka teaches voltage driving control block (201, 202, and 203) (see Fig. 8, Col. 8, Lines 8-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have using the modular control design of Ishizuka in the overall display design of Suzuki, since more data driving circuit make the display panel uniform (See Ishizuka Col.3, Lines 1-4).

As to claim 6, Suzuki and Hashimoto teach the electro-luminescence display device according to claim 5, wherein said current driver includes:

a plurality of current driving circuit (CS1…CSx) corresponding to each data lines applying the current signal corresponding to the plurality of gamma voltage signals (see

Hashimoto, Fig. 11), said current driving circuit having 1 subgroups; and a plurality of second switches (S1…Sx) between each of the current driving circuit and each of the data lines and wherein the second switches are turned on by a control signal (i.e. since the current driving circuit feed each data line according to the control signal controlling S based on the image data they form display components dedicated for each line) (see Suzuki, Fig. 4, 6, Col. 4, Line 40- Col. 5, Line 40).

As to claim 7, Suzuki teaches the electro-luminescence display device according to claim 6, wherein the control signal remains at a first level during the first time (T1) and remaining at second level during the second time (T2) (see Fig. 6, Col. 5, Lines 1-40).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 13,15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CALVIN C. MA whose telephone number is (571)270-1713. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chanh Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-7772. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Calvin Ma/
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/Chanh Nguyen/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629